

REMARKS

Claim 13 has been amended for clarity. All of the amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure of this application in at least the original claims, drawing figures and pages 2-10 of the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced. The claim has not been narrowed.

Claims 1-19 remain pending upon entry of the amendments, with claims 1, 9 and 13 being independent.

Rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

Claim 13 has been amended to place same in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 1-4, 9 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by US. Pub. No. 2004/0107368 (hereinafter, Colvin)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In Colvin, before contents are downloaded to a first device, the user must supply personal registration information, such a user name, and email address. In addition, information may automatically be accessed from the first device to procure machine or device registration information, such as MAC address, hardware ID, and IP. (See 120 in Figure 2 of Colvin). The registration information, both personal and from the first device are utilized by an authentication code generator to generate an

authentication code (AC). The authentication code is then added to the content files that are stored in the first device. Thereafter, if the content files are transferred or copied to a second device, in order to use the content files, the second device is configured to prompt the user to enter personal information or registration information, which is used to compare with the authentication code added to the content files. Only if a portion of the registration information matches the authentication code, the content files may be opened. (See paragraph 0123 of Colvin).

This contrasts with an exemplary embodiment of the present application, in which contents are downloaded to a first terminal and stored along with terminal identification information of the first terminal. Thereafter, if the contents are copied or transferred to a second terminal, the terminal identification information of the first terminal attached to the contents is compared with the terminal identification information of the second terminal. Since the terminal identification information is unique to each of the terminals, there will not be a match and the user of the second terminal is queried whether he or she wishes to register the contents by connecting to a contents server. Upon approval by the user of the second terminal to register the contents, the terminal identification information of the second terminal replaces the terminal identification of the first terminal in the contents. Since at this point, the terminal information of the second terminal is attached to the contents, the second terminal may open the contents.

In the exemplary embodiment of the present application, there is no requirement to input highly personal registration information that is permanently attached to the contents, as in Colvin. Further, in the exemplary embodiment of the present application, there is no need to generate an authentication code by

prompting an authentication code generator to generate an authentication code, which saves processing time that would otherwise drain precious battery and other resources of the terminal. In addition, in the exemplary embodiment of the present application, there is no requirement for the user to enter highly personal information, each time a contents file is downloaded and stored, or prior to opening a transferred or copied contents file in another device.

Claim 1

The Examiner alleged that Colvin teaches a method of storing and reproducing contents, comprising connecting to a contents sever, downloading contents from the contents server, and storing the downloaded contents along with *terminal identification information of a first terminal by the first terminal*, and transmitting the contents with the terminal identification information to a second terminal by the first terminal. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, in Colvin, before contents are downloaded to a first device, the user must supply personal registration information, such a user name, and email address. In addition, information may automatically be accessed from the first device to procure machine or device registration information, such as MAC address, hardware ID, and IP. (See 120 in Figure 2 of Colvin). The registration information, both personal and from the first device are utilized by an authentication code generator to generate an authentication code (AC). The authentication code is then added to the content files that are stored in the first device.

Claim 1 recites storing the downloaded contents along with terminal identification information of a first terminal. The terminal identification information is

unique to each terminal (see page 3, first full paragraph of the present application, as filed) and does not require incorporation therein of personal information or other device registration information such as MAC address, hardware ID, and IP, as in Colvin.

Further, the Examiner alleged that Colvin teaches comparing the terminal identification information attached to the contents with terminal identification information of the second terminal, and if the terminal identification information is identical, reproducing the contents by the second terminal. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In Colvin, the authentication code is incorporated to the contents file that may be copied or transferred to another device. The authentication code does not change after it is created. Therefore, it would not be possible for Colvin to compare the terminal identification information attached to the contents from a first terminal with terminal identification information of the second terminal, and if the terminal identification information is identical, reproduce the contents by the second terminal.

Colvin does not teach the elements of claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 9

The Examiner alleged that Colvin teaches a method of storing contents in a terminal, comprising the steps of: connecting to a contents server and downloading contents; reading preliminarily stored terminal identification information; and storing the downloaded contents together with the read terminal identification information.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, the terminal identification information is unique to each terminal. Claim 9 recites connecting to a contents server and downloading contents, reading preliminarily stored terminal identification information, and storing the downloaded contents together with the read terminal identification information.

In contrast, in Colvin, before contents are downloaded to a first device, the user must supply personal registration information, such a user name, and email address. In addition, information may automatically be accessed from the first device to procure machine or device registration information, such as MAC address, hardware ID, and IP. (See 120 in Figure 2 of Colvin). The registration information, both personal and from the first device are utilized by an authentication code generator to generate an authentication code (AC). The authentication code is then added to the content files that are stored in the first device. The authentication code of Colvin is not identical to the claimed terminal identification information.

Colvin does not teach the elements of claim 9. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 13

The Examiner alleged that Colvin teaches a method of reproducing contents in a terminal, comprising the steps of checking *terminal identification information attached to stored contents*, *comparing the terminal identification information attached to the contents with terminal identification information of the terminal*, and reproducing the contents, wherein the terminal identification information is attached

to the contents with terminal identification information of the terminal. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, the terminal identification information is unique to each terminal.

In contrast, in Colvin, before contents are downloaded to a first device, the user must supply personal registration information, such a user name, and email address. In addition, information may automatically be accessed from the first device to procure machine or device registration information, such as MAC address, hardware ID, and IP. (See 120 in Figure 2 of Colvin). The registration information, both personal and from the first device are utilized by an authentication code generator to generate an authentication code (AC). The authentication code is then added to the content files that are stored in the first device. The authentication code of Colvin is not identical to the claimed terminal identification information.

Colvin does not teach the elements of claim 13. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 2-4 and 14-17

Claims 2-4 and 14-17 depend from independent claims 1, 9 and 13. Since Colvin does not anticipate all of the elements of independent claims 1, 9 and 13, as argued above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 14-17 is requested.

Rejection of claims 5, 6, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colvin in view of US. Pub. No. 2005/0004873 (hereinafter, Pou)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner acknowledged that Colvin does not disclose the elements specific to claims 5, 6, 18 and 19, and cited Pou for the sole purpose of allegedly disclosing such elements. However, Pou does not cure the deficiencies of Colvin, with regard to independent claims 1 and 13 from which claims 5, 6, 18 and 19 depend. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colvin in view of US. Pub. No. 2002/0016846 (hereinafter, Ono)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner acknowledged that Colvin does not disclose the elements specific to claims 7 and 11, and cited Ono for the sole purpose of allegedly disclosing such elements. However, Ono does not cure the deficiencies of Colvin, with regard to independent claims 1 and 9 from which claims 7 and 11 depend. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejection of claims 8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Colvin in view of US. Pub. No. 2003/0195851 (hereinafter, Ong)

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner acknowledged that Colvin does not disclose the elements specific to claims 8, 10 and 12, and cited Ong for the sole purpose of allegedly disclosing such elements. However, Ong does not cure the deficiencies of Colvin, with regard to independent claims 1 and 9 from which claims 8, 10 and 12 depend. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Application Serial No.: 10/584,239
Response Filed: May 20, 2011

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments which may be incurred in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 18-2220.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 20, 2011

/Wonki Park/
Wonki Park, Reg. No. 38,991

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
Main: (202) 659-9076
Direct: (202) 530-4470